

USSN: 10/608,521
Docket No. 2003-0059-01**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 remain in the above-captioned United States Patent Application.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner acknowledging that the amendments to page 8 of the Specification submitted in the Response to the Office Action, dated October 25, 2007, correct the problem noted by the Examiner in that Office Action.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner acknowledging that the amendments made in response to the telephone interview with the Examiner on December 12, 2007, (Summary mailed December 14, 2007), remove the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112 discussed in the interview. Applicants understand that the Examiner has entered the claim amendments in the "PROPOSED CLAIM AMENDMENTS" submitted in response to the telephone interview of December 4, 2007.

The Examiner has, however, now pointed to certain "flaws in the wording" of the claim amendments, specifically referring to the language "wherein the pretreatment is prior to use of the multi-layered dielectric reflectivity coated substrate in one or more applications that expose the coating to optical fluence." The Examiner has proposed an amendment to this language to read "wherein the pretreatment is prior to the use of the multi-layered dielectric reflectivity coated substrate in an optical system, where one or more applications that expose the coating to DUV optical fluence occur."

Applicants have made this amendment to the language of Claim 1, and thus, remove any perceived lack of written description, overly broad scope and/or ambiguity to which the Examiner has referred.

The Examiner has referred to the use of "trademarks," specifically referencing "ARO OPuS" and "ARO" on page 4, lines 9-12 and 29; page 5, lines 5 and 23; page 6, lines 1-5; page 7, lines 8-14, page 8, lines 11-15, 19 and 24, and requires such "trademarks" to be indicated by all capitals and generic terminology used when referencing such "trademarks."

Applicants respectfully disagree that these references are to "trademarks."

Page 1 of the above-captioned Patent Application makes reference to an "optical pulse stretching unit," internally referred to by Applicants' assignee and abbreviated as an "OPuS" (p. 1, line 20), such as are sold by Applicants' assignee as part of high power

applicants' interview summary partially correct, see section 1 of the final rejection response for clarification.

/MLP/
9/12/2008